H

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,644	03/30/2001	Andre Litster	3254.2.1	8266

21552   7590   12/31/2003

MADSON & METCALF
GATEWAY TOWER WEST
SUITE 900
15 WEST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101

EXAMINER
EDOUARD, PATRICK NESTOR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	12

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ___3___ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Oct 21, 2003* _____ .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-10, 13-30, 33-40, and 59-72* _____ is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-10, 13-30, 33-40, and 59-72* _____ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to communication filed 10/21/03 (paper #11). Claims 1-10,

13-30, 33-40 and new claims 59-72 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1- have been considered but are moot in view

of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-6, 10, 13-26, 30, and 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Atkin et al (6,490,547) in view of Bell (6,275,978).

As per claims 1, 21 and 40 , Atkin et al teach a system for providing multiple language

support for at least one application program, (figures 2-3)the system comprising:

"A plurality of language resource bundles comprising association between

languages keys and displayable language sensitive elements, each resource bundle corresponding

to a different language"(col. 3, lines 36-67, his resource bundle 208 with different natural

languages being supported by different resource bundles that comprises text string with

identifiers)

"A language resource manager configured to receive a first language key from an

application program, locate a language resource bundle corresponding to a currently-selected

language, identify a language sensitive element associated with the first language key, and provide

the identified language sensitive element to the application program for display in a graphical user

interface"(col. 3, lines 36-67, his language management module is used by the user to select the

language in which text strings for user application are to be displayed within the user interface and

causes the appropriate resource bundle to be loaded).

It is noted that Atkin et al teaches the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach

wherein one association is specific to a particular application. However, this feature is well known

in the art as evidenced by Bell who teaches at col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 38 the use of a second

key to assist the resource bundle generator in the localization of the input string   wherein the

second key is descriptive and provide some context with respect to the specific application to be

translated. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

would have it obvious to incorporate into Aktin the context key specific to an application as

taught Bell because it would provide for an increase in the reliability of the localization.

Atkin et al further teach at least one association is applicable to a plurality of applications

(Col. 4, lines 16-42).

As per claims 2 and 22 , Atkin et al teach an application program configured to provide a language key to the language resource manager, receive a language sensitive element from the language resource manager and display the language sensitive element in a graphical user interface" (col. 3, lines 40-56, when a user selects a particular human language for user application , language manager modules causes the appropriate resource bundle to be loaded).

As per claims 3 and 23, Atkin et al teach wherein at least one language sensitive element is selected from the group consisting of a text string, an icon, a graphic and a video clip"(col. 3, lines 36-44, user applications includes a number of functional modules with user interfaces including text strings...).

As per claims 4 and 24, Atkin et al teach wherein the language resource manger is further configured to display a language switching mechanism in the graphical user interface for changing the currently selected language in response to user input"(figure 3, col. 4, lines 53 to col. 5, line 40, upon requesting by the user a change in the human language in which the user interface is displayed, the requested language is loaded if it supported by the user application).

As per claims 5 and 25, Atkin et al tech wherein the language switching mechanism is selected from the group consisting of drop down list, a menu, a button, an edit box and an icon (col. 4, line 64-66, the user interface text in requested language using for instance a drop down list or a menu is loaded).

As per claims 10, 13- 20, 30 and 33-39, Atkin et al teach wherein the language resource

manager is in communication with a plurality of applications...(His language management module

204).

As per claim 6 and 26, Atkin et al teach wherein the language resource manger is further

configured to change the currently selected language in response to at least one keystroke (col. 4,

lines 57-59, the user requested the language changed using fir instance one keystroke).

5.   Claims 7-9 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Atkin et al (6,490,547) in view of Bell (6,265,978) as applied to claim 1 and 21 above and further

in view of Hetherington et al (6,469,713).

It is noted that Atkin ('547') teaches a user requested a change in the human language in

which the user interface is displayed and if the requested language is supported by the user

application , the user interface is loaded, but does not explicitly teach a language switching

component configured to receive from the language resource manager a second language sensitive

element and replace the first language sensitive element with the second language sensitive

element in the graphical user interface. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced

by Hetherington et al who teach a method for dynamic language switching wherein user interface

dialogs may reload the contents of displays , updating the user interface display to contain the

contents of menu labels, help text in the new human language or display text formatted in

accordance with the new cultural convention at he abstract and col. 4, lines 11-65. Therefore, one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate into the combination (Aktin with Bell) a language switching component as taught by Hetherington because it would enable remote support by users employing different languages, setting user interface display languages based on user preference.

6.   Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkin et al (6,490,547) in view of Matheny et al (5,551,055).

As per claim 59, Atkin et al teach a system for providing multiple language support for at least one application program comprising:

"A plurality of language resource bundles comprising association between language keys , each resource bundle corresponding to a different language ; and a language resource manager configured to receive a first language key from an application program, locate a language resource bundle corresponding to a selected language " (col. 3, line 36 to col. 4, line 42, his resource bundles 208 corresponding with different human languages).

It is noted that Aktin et al teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach associating language keys with non text displayable elements and identifying the non-text language sensitive element associated with the first language. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Matheny et al who teach a dictionary that stores one or more key/value pairs wherein the key is an object   which combines the ID and the locale and the value is the user interface element itself that can be an icon or a graphical representation (i.e. non-text)

at col. 1, lines 35-60. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made would have found it obvious to incorporate into the resources bundles as by taught Atkin

the language keys with non-text displayable as taught Matheny because it would provide a

versatile system capable of using text and non-text displayable elements that may be culturally

dependent which will facilitate the use of the system by different individuals.

7.   Claims 60-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkin et al

(6,490,547) in view of Hetherington et al (6,469,713).

As per claim 60, a system for providing multiple language support for at least one

application program, the system comprising:

" a plurality of resource bundles comprising associations between language keys

and displayable language sensitive elements, each resource bundle corresponding to a different

language" (col. 3, lines 36 to col. 4, line 42).

It is noted that Atkin et al teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach "A

language switching component to preempt an application program, save a state of the application

program, discard the graphical user interface being currently displayed, generate a new graphical

user interface comprising at least one new language sensitive element indicated buy a language

resource bundle for a received key, restore the state of the application and resume of the

application program". However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by

Hetherington et al who teach   a method for dynamic language switching wherein user interface

dialogs may reload the contents of displays , updating the user interface display to contain the

contents of menu labels, help text in the new human language or display text formatted in

accordance with the new cultural convention at he abstract and col. 4, lines 11-65. Therefore, one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to

incorporate into the combination (Aktin with Bell) a language switching component as taught by

Hetherington because it would enable remote support by users employing different languages,

setting user interface display languages based on user preference.

As per claims 61 and 62, Atkin et al teach a parser configured to parse   a language

resource file comprising descriptors of language keys and descriptors of language sensitive

elements and to generate therefrom language resource bundle"; and wherein the language

resource bundle comprises human readable text" (col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 36).

Claims 63-72 are the same in scope and content as claims 60-62 above and therefore are

rejected under the same rationale.

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office

action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is

reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR

1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however,

will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final

action.

9. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

    Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

    Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to:

    (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry) Or:

    (703) 305-9508 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or

"DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington.

VA.,Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Patrick N. Edouard whose telephone number is (703) 308-6725. The

examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 07:30 a.m.-6:00 p.m.

    If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (703) 305-9645.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 305-9508. Alternatively, facsimile messages

may be sent directly to (703) 305-9644 where they will be stored in the examiner's voice mailbox

(telling the examiner that a fax was received) and be automatically printed (i.e. - no delay by the

examiner).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be

directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patrick N. Edouard

December 19, 2003

PATRICK N. EDOUARD
PATENT EXAMINER